

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,170	10/04/2005	Gloria Hermida Borrego	Q-85426	9227
23373	7590 09/22/2006		EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC			LACYK, JOHN P	
2100 PENNS	YLVANIA AVENUE, 1	N.W.		
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON DC 20037			3735	

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/04/05.

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

Attachment(s)

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.

6) Other: \_\_\_

Notice of Informal Patent Application

Art Unit: 3735

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(b) because they are incomplete. 37 CFR 1.83(b) reads as follows:

When the invention consists of an improvement on an old machine the drawing must when possible exhibit, in one or more views, the improved portion itself, disconnected from the old structure, and also in another view, so much only of the old structure as will suffice to show the connection of the invention therewith.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance. With the preliminary amendment filed 01/05/05, applicant states that new sheets of drawings are submitted correcting errors, specifically Figure 5 shows two separate Figures and Figure 7 was omitted. However there does not appear to be any new

Application/Control Number: 10/520,170 Page 3

Art Unit: 3735

sheets of drawings submitted with this preliminary amendment, in that Figure 5 still appears to be two separate Figures and Figure 7 is still missing.

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 3. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 4. The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. Claim 1, for one example only, is directed to "Equipment for detection of detectable surgical elements, of the type which use ...", it is unclear whether the scanning unit and control unit are part of the "Equipment" or part of the detectable surgical products.
- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/520,170 Page 4

Art Unit: 3735

6. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fabian et al (2003/0105394) in view of Schneider (6,073,043).

Fabian et al discloses a device for detecting surgical implements inside the body. The device includes a scanning unit or detection unit that emits an electromagnetic signal and when the electromagnetic signal is moved the metal alloy of the implements results in a signal that is a different harmonic than the emitted signal that is detected by the detection unit. While Fabian et al discloses the claimed device it does not specifically teach the use of a computer controlling the device or specifically teaching using 3 indicators with the specific frequency ranges. Schneider discloses a device that uses electromagnetic signals to detect the location of an implement inside the body and teaches that it is well known to use more than one sensor and to have the device controlled by use of a computer and associated computer programming. Therefore a modification of Fabian et al to include more than one sensor would have been obvious since this would allow for a more accurate sensing and to include a computer controlling means would have been obvious since this would allow for a faster more accurate detecting of the surgical implements. While the prior art does not specifically teach the ranges of the sensors to use any set ranges based upon the suitability for the intended use for the proper detection would have been obvious.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Fabian et al (2003/0066537) and (5,057,095) and Greenberg are cited to further show the state of the art.

Application/Control Number: 10/520,170 Page 5

Art Unit: 3735

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John P. Lacyk whose telephone number is 571-272-4728. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chuck Marmor, II can be reached on 571-272-4730. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

John P Lacyk
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3735

J.P. Lacyk